THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. V. JULY, 1925. No. 7.

Conversion after Death.

A Criticism of Prof. O. Hallesby.

W. H. T. DAU, St. Louis, Mo.

Prof. O. Hallesby of the *Menighetsfakultet* at Oslo, practically a theological seminary within the Norwegian State Church, enjoys the reputation of a conservative, yea, an orthodox Lutheran theologian. He recently visited his countrymen in the United States and was well received in the Norwegian Lutheran churches. His opposition, some years ago, to the liberalism which has become dominant also in the Lutheran Church of Norway attracted a good deal of attention and brought him well-merited praise, for he did champion the cause of a purer Lutheran faith than that held by leading Norwegian churchmen. It is likely, however, that his Lutheran orthodoxy must be discounted, and that in him the Church is witnesssing another instance of a conservatism in doctrine that is merely a reduced liberalism — a phenomenon not infrequently observed among the Fundamentalists in our country in their controversy with the Modernists. In a criticism of the professor's teaching, *Redaktoer* Axel B. Svensson (*Nya Vaektaren*, February, 1925) offers food for reflection. He heads his article: "Is there a Conversion [1]) after Death? Some Reflections Elicited by an Article of Prof. O. Hallesby." The chief interest which our readers will have in this article is not so much the fact that it is a criticism of Professor Hallesby, whom few of our readers know, as rather the point of doctrine that is discussed. Mr. Svensson says:

"The question concerning the possibility of conversion after death is quite old. Within the Christian Church teachers could be pointed out at nearly all times who answered the question affirmatively. It happens that in our days the overwhelming majority of theologians believes that an improvement and con-

1) The Swedish term is *baettring*, which is equal to the German *Besserung*.

version [2]) may take place even in the domain of the dead. Among the advocates of this view there are found many important men in olden times, and that in our day it is not radical theologians only who embrace this doctrine appears, amongst others, from an article of Prof. O. Hallesby which was published in *For Fattig og Rik* [For Poor and Rich].

"Even in our country [Sweden] the Norwegian professor enjoys great confidence in religious circles, and we would commit a grave neglect of duty if we failed to express our opinion of the aforementioned article. As regards his doctrinal position, the article contains nothing that the professor has not allowed to come to light already in his *Troslaere;* [3]) it is, however, significant inasmuch as it leads one to fear that his advancement from the left to the right, which was characteristic of Hallesby and full of promise, has now come to an end.

"To those who have read Hallesby and know him not through his preaching only or through some lecture it is no secret that he certainly does not take the old believing standpoint in all points of doctrine. For instance, he does not believe that the entire Bible is God's Word in the sense that everything that is written therein has come into it by divine inspiration, and on several other points he occupies a standpoint that departs from the Confessions. Among these points of doctrine is also the one concerning conversion after death. One would be pretty sure of rendering himself guilty of an incorrect judgment by maintaining that Hallesby occupies a position more true to the Confessions than, for instance, the Swedish professor Kolmodin. Weighed in the balances of fidelity to the Confessions, they still poise fairly even, although, of course, they are out of balance in one point or another. And yet there is a great difference between them, so great that it has kept us hitherto from taking a stand against Professor Hallesby.

"Professor Kolmodin's development has plainly advanced from old-time confessional fidelity with a pietistic coloring to a position that has become modernist in many important points. As a result, his fidelity to the Confessions has entirely disappeared as if by some bleaching process, while his pietism proves itself to be altogether of fast color.[4]) The result of this, again, has been that he

---

2) *baettring och omvaendelse.*

3) *Glaubenslehre,* Doctrine of Faith — the title of Dr. Hallesby's *Dogmatik.*

4) *traettaekta,* the German *waschecht.*

is embraced with great confidence even by many who certainly do not approve his theological departures from the old faith. They have overlooked the fact that a development from right to left is a development in a faulty and dangerous direction, a development which renders its representative — no matter in what personal relation to him one may stand — a danger to many an old-time believer. He is that spite of the fact that he may be said to have been a help to missions, to doubting students, and in the war with a plainly radical theology.

"The case of Professor Hallesby is entirely different. He hails from the radical camp, and his development has been from left to right. That is the true direction. His progress hitherto has not been from faith to unbelief, but he has passed from doubt to old-time faith. There has really been ground for hoping that the day would come when he would fully stand, in every respect, upon the basis of the Evangelical Lutheran Confessions, even though the pietistic coloring is seen in him, and that quite strong. Just for the reason that he was headed in the right direction, one was induced to believe that his activity was being blessed, and there is much evidence that it was. Of course, one could not avoid a curious expectation in regard to particular matters: one was compelled to wish that the day would come when he would refute some of his own statements in *Troslaeren;* his open-minded honesty justified the conviction that, if some day he would come to see that he had erred, he would frankly acknowledge the fact.

"However, in the aforementioned article in *For Fattig og Rik* he comes forward now and maintains with very great definitiveness the view that opportunities for conversion will be afforded even after death — a doctrine which, as far as we know, he has held from the very beginning of his appearing in public. We had hoped that this doctrine was part of the old leaven in him of which he would gradually become purged. If his development in the right direction had continued, this hope would certainly have been realized. But, alas! from his article one receives this impression, amongst others, that one is listening to a person who has arrived at a point where he stands calculating whether his development in the right direction shall be continued, or whether it is concluded. There is no direct statement to that effect, but the tone of his speech suggests it.

"The Professor introduces his article with these words: 'I have been informed recently that some of my brethren in the faith have been troubled and grieved over my doctrine concerning

the redeeming work of Christ in the realm of the dead, which in popular parlance is called "conversion after death."

"'When I heard this it caused me not a little sadness; for I would not, indeed, cause my brethren worry. However, I do not see that I can do anything in the matter. For what I have written about this question I have written because I was convinced in my inmost heart that it was in accordance with God's Word.'

"And now he proceeds to state more precisely his standpoint, which yet seems quite undefined because he pays no attention whatever to logical consequences. He states emphatically that he does not at all believe in an opportunity *for us* [italics mine] to be converted after death. Accordingly, he does not deny eternal punishment. He expresses his astonishment that among the Christians in Norway there are some who would saddle on him the doctrine that ultimately all men will be saved. One can well understand his resentment over these accusations, which, it cannot be denied, are unjustified from his point of view. But if he had kept his eyes open to the consequences resulting from his own teaching, he would have understood quite well those whom he now regards as slanderers. For if there is a possibility of conversion after death for some, commonest justice demands that all shall have that possibility, because between grace offered within the limits of time and grace offered within the limits of eternity we cannot place the sign of equality. No comparison is possible at this point. The standpoint occupied by Hallesby is logically untenable. However, that would be of little moment, because men's logic is often 'a strange critter,' and it can certainly happen that God's logic lies upon a plane so high that we can never grasp it here in time; His thoughts are higher than ours. But the doctrine of conversion after death is unbiblical, and that settles the matter.

"Next, Professor Hallesby cites quite a number of teachers of the Church who have held the same or a similar opinion as himself. He admits, however, that the question cannot be decided by any kind of a majority resolution. It is good that this is so; for even if that could be done, the Professor would not be able to line up the required majority. The Confession of the Christian Church is the expression of its faith, and in that Confession there is not a word said concerning a doctrine of conversion after death as an integral part of the Christian faith. As great as the authority of the Church's Confession is, still it could not change truth into a lie nor a lie into truth. Scripture remains the one real judge of all doctrines, as the reformers so vigorously maintained.

Accordingly, we leave entirely out of consideration what this or that teacher of the Church believed and taught regarding the question under discussion. What we are after is to see what the Bible teaches.

"In support of his doctrine Professor Hallesby really adduces only two Bible-passages. They are 1 Pet. 3, 18—20 and 4, 6. On the interpretation of these two passages opinions have been divided for some time, especially as regards the former passage, which will have to be regarded as the most important. For in 1 Pet. 4, 6 there is nothing said plainly and clearly regarding the time of the Gospel-preaching mentioned in that text. There is nothing in that text that would prohibit us from understanding the word of the apostle thus, *viz.*, he says that even to those who are now dead the Gospel was preached while they were living. Certainly one can, as Hallesby and many with him are doing, find in the aforementioned Bible-text a claim that the Gospel is being preached to the spirits of departed men, and viewed from the linguistic side such a reading lies nearest.[5] But that eliminates the fact that a number of Bible-passages definitely deny that any conversion is possible after death. It cannot be right that in the one Bible-text in question, which seems to contain either one of two meanings, we should on a very weak linguistic ground choose that meaning which comes in plain conflict with the teaching that prevails throughout the Scriptures. Herewith we drop this text.

"1 Pet. 3, 18—20 presents greater difficulties. Here it could be maintained with reason that the word *phylake*, which has been rendered by *faengelse* (prison) in our translation, is often used in Greek literature to denote a limited measure or time beyond which one cannot go, as, for instance, a staked-off space, a prison in the ordinary meaning. And there is quite a weighty reason for the view, suggested by Gen. 6, 3, that in the present instance the word really points to a definite time.[6] However, what is re-

---

5) I do not think this view is tenable, because the text does not speak of "spirits of the departed." Moreover, the verb in this text is in the aorist, not in the present tense. Lastly, the men to whom the apostle here refers underwent a judgment in the flesh, or as regards the flesh, as the Gospel was preached to them. This could not apply to disembodied spirits.

6) Too much, I think, is conceded here. The only plain texts in the New Testament where *phylake* signifies a space of time is in its application to the various "watches" of the night, and then it is given with some numeral. To transfer that meaning to 1 Pet. 3, 19, where *en phylake* is a prepositional phrase qualifying *tois pneumasin* is, to say the least, a rather desperate attempt.

quired here is not a philological discussion, but a determination not to frame any ideas beyond what is written.

"Accordingly, we shall call attention to another matter that has often surprised us when reading expositions of the text before us. The apostle indicates, if one takes his words in their ordinary meaning, that the "prison" signifies the place where the spirits of the men who perished in the Flood dwelt, but he does not indicate with one word that Christ preached *in* the prison.[7] It is of great importance that nothing be put into a Bible-text that is not contained in it. The apostle does not say that Christ in the spirit departed and preached in prison to spirits who were in that place. It is safest to let the Word of God stand as it is. But if, in an attempt to obtain an understanding of the contents of this text, one should demand a paraphrase of it, it would be much better to let this be the content: Christ went in spirit and preached to spirits who were in prison.

"However, this entire question regarding the place and time of Christ's preaching to spirits may be regarded as a discussion beside the mark. *For there is not one word in the text that gives one the right to infer that the preaching in question was a proclamation of the Gospel or led to the conversion of any one.* When Professor Hallesby assumes that the preaching now under discussion was a proclamation of the Gospel for such as had died in unbelief, that is no more than an assumption. There is no support for this assumption in the text. Nor does it afford any solid basis for the ancient interpretation (which, however, is at least not contrary to Scripture) that in this preaching Christ announced to the unbelieving His victory, in order to show them that they were justly damned because they did not believe the preaching of Noah. The text states clearly and plainly only this, that Christ preached to the spirits in prison. We repeat that the text contains nothing which gives us the right to infer that there is an opportunity for conversion after death. It has not pleased the Lord to let us know more about this matter, and we must learn to obey God's Word

---

7) I cannot see that anything is gained by this instance. Besides, taking the words in their ordinary meaning, this is what they say: "Having gone, He preached to the spirits in prison." The preaching took place to the spirits, and in order to preach, Christ went where the spirits were. The meaning that connects most naturally with these words is that the preaching took place where the spirits were, and that was "in prison." Of course, Christ could have made the spirits understand Him from ever so great a distance, but in that case it is queer that He should have *gone* (*poreutheis*) to their place.

and 'not think beyond what is written.' Even professors of theology must submit to this admonition of Paul.

"Such is the poor support for this misleading doctrine of the possibility of conversion after death that its champions must for their strongest proof appeal to a Bible-text that indeed speaks of preaching, but gives no hint of conversion. Verily, a mighty poor support!

"The Bible knows of not more than two states after death. Those who die believing are saved, and the consummation of their salvation takes place after their resurrection. Those who die unbelieving are damned, and the consummation of their damnation takes place after their resurrection. To what extent there are degrees in blessedness we leave undecided, since it does not devolve upon us to bring on an unnecessary discussion, and since there is ground for different interpretations of Scripture regarding this matter. For instance, Scripture teaches that the heathen who sin without the Law perish without the Law. Accordingly, we who have the Law cannot perish without the Law. If we are lost, our perdition is in accordance with the Law, and that means everlasting torment in hell. What the meaning of perishing without the Law may be we do not know. We only know that it does *not* mean the same thing as being saved, but is a loss. But when the Savior speaks of a condition that shall be 'tolerable in the Day of Judgment' and clearly indicates that such shall be the condition of those who had no opportunity of grace, or only a small one, He therewith comes to the aid of those who might perhaps be led into doubting the goodness of God, *viz.*, if they were forced to believe that the Lord judges the poor heathen just as severely as us Christians. For when the Lord says that such will be the condition of those who are lost without having had an opportunity of grace or only a small one, then our condition on Judgment Day will be altogether unbearable. Of this there is no doubt.

"But of a mission to the dead or conversion after death Scripture says nothing. There is not a single text that teaches such a doctrine provided the words are allowed to stand as they stand. If we are to read out of the Bible a doctrine of an opportunity for grace after death, we shall, on the one hand, have to twist and turn a number of texts, forcing them to yield a meaning that we had desired beforehand, and, on the other hand, we shall have to look away from many passages which clearly teach us that 'in the place where the tree falleth, there it shall be.' This may prove shocking, but — it is so.

"According to Scripture, man consists of body, soul, and spirit. In death, soul and spirit separate from the body, which decomposes. The body has received impressions from the qualities of the soul and spirit indwelling in it. A drunkard's body craves spirits, a harlot's and fornicator's licentious affairs that are aflame with lust. Now, if the soul and spirit after their separation from the body become converted to God, where will they go on the day of resurrection? Can they be united in bliss with the godless body, which, according to Scripture, must also be sanctified? It had in the mean time undergone no sanctifying process, just as little as the dead bodies of other unconverted men. Shall the harlot's lips trained to smutty songs be able to sing the new song of the Lamb?

"As an absolute and indispensable condition of our sharing in the resurrection of the righteous the Bible stipulates that the Spirit of God shall have dwelt in us during our lifetime. In Rom. 8, 11 we read: 'If the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by His Spirit that dwelleth in you.' Here is a plain and clear statement, and we are, indeed, wondering whether Professor Hallesby, after pondering the contents of this statement, can uphold his teaching that man is converted after death. If he does, he will stick fast in his tracks, and then it will not be long before his development will have to proceed in a different direction from the one which was noticeable so far. But we are sincerely hoping that this man, who is in such a high degree qualified especially for speaking to our academic youth, will not be caught in any erroneous teaching, but in the future as in the past will develop in a direction away from doubt and misbelief to old-time faith. We are hoping for the day to come when he will, in a much better way than we ourselves are able, go forth to battle both against the doctrine of conversion after death, which lulls men to sleep, and against the rather incautious and fatal Bible criticism for which he now wants to claim a place in positive faith in the Bible."

Every lover and well-wisher of our Lutheran Zion will support this Christian wish and pray that all who are still caught in any unscriptural notion will be enabled by the grace of our Lord to struggle out of the meshes that hold them and come into the full light and freedom of that faith which has written on its banner: *Οὐδὲν ἄτερ γραφῆς!*

In its March issue *Nya Vaektaren* refers once more to Pro-

fessor Hallesby and says: "Recently he delivered two public lectures here in Stockholm in which he attacked liberal theology and the liberal theologians. It goes without saying that on many points he maintained the truth. For our part we have no exceptions to take as regards the attack upon the Liberals in this lecture. They deserve all that they got. In particular, the last of the Professor's two lectures was excellent, and it was not its least merit that he directed attention to those who, spite of lively assertions of their own positive faith, spread their sheltering and protecting wings over liberal theologians. As examples in Sweden of such peaceable conservatives the speaker named Bishop Danell and Pastor Valdus Bengtsson.

"There is no reason whatever why we should rise in defense of these gentlemen. However, we think we ought to inform Professor Hallesby amongst other things of the fact that the last-named gentleman has very likely entered into as intimate connections and sympathies [with liberal theology] as the professors in the two organizations which arranged the meeting [at which Professor Hallesby spoke]. The unquestioned facts in the case are these: *Fosterlandsstiftelsen* some time ago excluded from its fellowship and cooperation the *Bibeltrogna Vaenner* [see THEOL. MONTHLY, II, 289], although the latter fully maintained the Evangelical Lutheran Confessions in every point. The real reason for this expulsion was because the *Bibeltrogna Vaenner* would not and could not keep silent over against liberal tendencies which began to manifest themselves in *Evangelisk Fosterlandsstiftelsen.* The *Bibeltrogna Vaenner* continued their fight as best they could. We rejoice over every good handshake we receive in this fight. Nothing would please us more than if Professor Hallesby would wholly and fully occupy the standpoint of the old Bible faith. As long as he does not do this, but maintains that 'there are errors in the Bible,' — and this refers not to the so-called apographa, or so-called interpolations, — we cannot with unmixed joy behold his appearance in public. For his strokes have partly lost their keenness because of his attitude in the Bible controversy, which is liberal in principle. This becomes manifest, for instance, in his debate with Pastor Anskar. We can also understand why a person like Valdus Bengtsson, who takes the identical position in the Bible controversy, should avoid taking a definite stand away from the plainly liberal. Naturally he reasons thus: I believe myself that the Bible is not the infallible Word of God; how, then, can I condemn so decidedly those who entertain doubts concerning

several more points than I myself? Now, that is not what Professor Hallesby thinks; but he blazes away with a big gun against any one who questions the truth of the Apostle's Creed in any point. And that is perfectly right. But his position would be twice as strong if he were to believe himself 'all that is written in the Law and the prophets.' If he were to do that, we should not only regard him as one of the best professional theologians of our time, but we should joyfully extend to him the hand of brotherly fellowship without reservation."

The Influence of Calvinism on Our American System of Education.

JOHN THEODORE MUELLER, St. Louis, Mo.

(Read before the Western District Teachers' Conference and published by request.)

PART II.

Ideas of Education.

What has been said so far shows how great the influence of Calvinism on American education of necessity must be. However, this influence was not exerted in a direct way. As far as the declaration of educational principles is concerned, Calvin himself was not a great educator, such as Luther and Melanchthon were. Monroe, in his *Text-book in the History of Education,* devotes but a few lines to John Calvin, whereas he gives pages of his book to Luther, Melanchthon, and others. Calvin did not even write a treatise on education, as Zwingli did, whose work *How to Educate the Young in Good Manners and Discipline* (1524), with its three parts: "1. Instruction in the things that belong to God; 2. in the things that pertain to self; 3. in the things that concern our fellow-men," shows a mind wide awake to the problems of Christian education. It is true, the ecclesiastical polity which Calvin established in Geneva in 1541 did not overlook the interests of education. Calvin there reorganized a Latin school and impressed upon it a rigorous type of discipline and piety. In summer the recitations began at six in the morning, in winter at seven. The students were required to attend divine worship once every school-day and three times on Sunday. *The Lord's Prayer and the Creed were in the course of study.* All the students were taught to sing and intone the psalms. As in the *Gymnasien* of Germany, the ancient languages, as an aid to Biblical exercises, occupied a large

part of the seven-year course. Calvin himself was one of the teachers, and it is said that his students daily numbered a thousand. In discussing a suitable head for the institution, he said: "Let the principal, being a man of at least average knowledge, be especially of a debonair spirit, and not rude or severe in his manner, in order that he may give a good example to the children in all his life, and that he may thus bear so much more gently the labor of his office." (F. V. N. Painter's *History of Education*, p. 172.) Of this school Hugh Reyburn, in his work *John Calvin; His Life, Letters, and Work*, says: "In addition to the desire to turn out men who were able to defend the Reformed faith and who were willing to propagate it, he desired to create an institution for the study of learning for its own sake. It was no mere theological hall which he desired to call into existence. It was a university, with a carefully graded system of instruction, with all the faculties in full working order, with the best men he could lay hands on in the professors' chairs, and with the richest endowments he could persuade donors to furnish. (Note influence on modern universities.) He himself had none of the specialist's narrowness. He specialized on the basis of a broad and deep culture. He was as competent to lecture on the classics as he was to lecture on the Gospels or Epistles. He knew as much about law as he did about theology.... He did all he could to attract to Geneva learned men. He surrounded himself with these men. He made them professors, regents, teachers, preachers, anything that would give them an opportunity of passing on to others the knowledge which they themselves had acquired. He himself was one of the most brilliant scholars of his time. . . . It became a commonplace that a boy of Geneva could give a more rational account of his faith than a Doctor of the Sorbonne. . . . He was by this time a physical wreck, and his strength was gone. But the work he did not only raised a bulwark in defense of liberty against which the waves of bigotry and intolerance beat in vain, but sent forth a stream of eager and well-trained disciples, who carried the war into the enemies' country and became all over Western Europe the most dangerous foes that Rome had to fear. Thanks to the spirit with which he inspired it by his labors in its councils, in its churches, and in its schools, he turned the little city into an impregnable stronghold, the metropolis of the Reformed faith, an ark of refuge to the distressed and persecuted, a seat of learning second to none in its day for attractiveness and influence, and the home of a race of brave, God-fearing men." (pp. 289. 290.) With regard to the university it might be

added that "all instruction was free, and that in the higher classes it was given in Latin. No degrees were given, but the equivalent of a graduation ceremony was found in Promotion Day, when the scholars formally received promotion from a lower class to a higher one." (Hugh Y. Reyburn, *o. c.,* p. 289.)

Thus, while John Calvin did not write books or treatises on education, he did organize a university, a school of learning, which represented the best educational ideas of his day and became the model to all who were influenced by him. Froude, in his *Short Studies on Great Subjects,* says of Calvinism: "Calvinism was the spirit which rises in revolt against untruth; the spirit which, as I have shown you, has appeared, and reappeared, and in due time will appear again, unless God be a delusion and man be as the beasts that perish." (p. 52.) This may be applied to education as represented at that time by the Roman Catholic Church. Vollmer, in his *Life of John Calvin,* asserts: "We to-day believe that the education of all citizens is fundamental to the welfare of the Republic. This principle, however, it should be understood, is a logical result of Calvinistic thought and practise. Calvinists, taught by the Holy Scriptures, made religion a personal matter, not between man and the Church, but between the soul and God, and necessitated personal knowledge on the part of human beings of God's Word as the law of faith and life. Education in religious truth became therefore a cardinal principle of the Calvinists, and the steps were easy and swift from it to secular and popular education. This logical connection between Calvinism and education is acknowledged by our historian Bancroft, who says that Calvin was the 'first founder of the public school system.' It is also shown by the history of popular education. A high authority states that Presbyterian Scotland 'is entitled to the credit of having first established schools for primary instruction to be supported at public expense.' The Scotch system of free education was founded in 1567, fifty years before the American Calvinist colonies had been established. Reformed Holland followed closely in the footsteps of Scotland, and the first settlers in New England and the Middle States, being themselves Calvinists, naturally proceeded at once, like their European brethren of similar faith, to care for the interests of education. Harvard, Yale, and Princeton universities were all founded by men who believed in the Westminster Confession, and as early as 1647 Massachusetts and Connecticut established public school systems." (pp. 204. 205.)

Richard G. Boone, Professor of Pedagogy in Indiana Univer-

sity, says: "John Calvin, at Geneva, in the sixteenth century, made education, so far as he might, obligatory upon all; and to-day the thrifty cantons of Switzerland enjoy the beneficent influence of a law of whose significance the author little dreamed. Tracing the growth of this impulse, George Bancroft says: 'The common-school system was derived from Geneva, the work of John Calvin, introduced by Luther into Germany [?], by John Knox into Scotland, and so became the property of the English-speaking nation." (*Education in the United States,* pp. 6. 7.) In the Colonies, in the New York settlements, schools were found as early as 1633. The second Director-General, Wouter Van Twiller, brought with him in 1633 Teacher Adam Roelandsen, the first schoolmaster. (p. 10.) In Virginia schools are mentioned as early as 1622. (p. 13.) In New England the people of Boston on the 13th of April, 1635, in town meeting assembled, "impressed not less with their need of schools than with their appreciation of education in general, requested 'Brother Philemon Purmont to become schoolmaster for the teaching and nurturing of children' in the town. In part pay for his services thirty acres of land were voted him by the young colony. Almost immediately 'a garden plot was voted to Mr. Danyell Maude, schoolmaster,' also. Both of these occurred within less than a year from the founding of the town. . . . Other Massachusetts towns also showed a vigorous and liberal spirit of culture. . . . Plymouth Colony had ordered schools as early as 1650, while ten years before Dorchester had petitioned for some islands 'for and towards the maintenance of a free school.'" (pp. 14. 15.) "It would seem that the first school in Connecticut was at New Haven, during the year 1638." (p. 18.) "The first school appearing on the town records of Hartford was in operation as early as 1641. . . . Throughout the Colonies, schools were endowed; first with lands, very early with bequests, rents, and donations, and supplemented by taxation. They were not free. Tuition was paid for all." (p. 19.)

"In Massachusetts, by the middle of the eighteenth century, and in other New England commonwealths shortly after, elementary schools were for the most part free. These early systems of public or free schools were largely due to the religious devotion of the New England people and to the practical identity of Church and State." (Monroe, *History of Education,* p. 35.) In this they carried out the principles which John Calvin had advocated at Geneva. These principles, which exerted so great an influence, we shall now briefly study. *(To be concluded.)*

THE THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.

A Syllabus of Reasons for Accepting the Bible. — Dr. Howard A. Kelly, M. D., LL. D., concludes his fine article on "Why I Accept the Bible Literally" in the *Sunday-school Times* of March 28 with the following syllabus of reasons for accepting the Bible as the Word of God: "It is the one book in the world which reveals a God infinitely above our own natural imaginings, worthy of our love and worship, and inexhaustible in his wonderful nature. The heart of man the whole world over ever hungers for God. St. Augustine cried, 'Lord, Thou hast made us for Thyself, and restless are our hearts until they rest in Thee.' The Bible-message is God's perfect answer to that despairing cry of our Spirit-starved humanity. The Bible is a miracle — one coherent message written by God's prophets over a period of centuries, comparable to nothing else on earth. It treats nature with a dignity and comprehension comparable to no other book ever penned. Alone does it reveal sin as the act of a traitor in rebellion against God. In opposition to false science and false religions it fixes the origin of sin at a particular time and in an individual Satan, and at the very outset promises sin's cessation forever when that arch-traitor shall be rendered forever impotent; then eternal peace will reign. It reveals God's righteousness in Christ, His judgment of sin, and His great mercy to every sinner who trusts Him. It is an intimate revelation of Christ, God-man, the only Savior of the world, to all His followers the Way, the Truth, and the Life. It reveals God's gift of His Holy Spirit — our ever-present Guide on our earthly pilgrimage. It is the one Book in the world which is always young and fresh and inspiring. The Bible has stood the persistent assaults of Satan and all its enemies through all ages, and it goes on shining with ever-increasing luster. Whatever there is in civilization that is worth while rests on the Bible's precepts. If only half the people would accept and apply the Bible wholeheartedly, the terrors which threaten our nation to-day would all vanish, and peace with her attendant blessings would reign. Everywhere and in all its teachings the Bible claims to be the authoritative Word of God, and as such I accept it."

There is another and more weighty reason, which Dr. Kelly describes in his article in the following words: "The Bible, unlike any other book in the world, is a living Word and as such its own valiant defender. All the arguments of the best of men and all their skill in assembling them effectively are but feeble apologies compared to the mordant power of the Word itself; the best human helps are those which have constant recourse to the Word." It is, after all, not the *fides humana,* but the *fides divina,* which assures the Christian that the Bible is God's Word. The Bible is its own best witness.

MUELLER.

Not Ambition, but Duty. — The *Lutheran Church Herald,* in a recent issue, quoting the *Minneapolis Journal,* says: "The phrase 'will to conquer' is a German invention, and the exhortation to

exhibit that will may be said to have sent Germany to her downfall. Yet the German who has influenced many more human beings and moved more nations than Bismarck was not a man animated by the will to conquer. Like great men in American History, he had no wonderful ambition, but trod the way of duty, to become surprised at his own greatness and even somewhat annoyed by his fame. A German scholar, Karl Holl, has devoted a lifetime of research to Martin Luther and has reconstructed in the thoroughgoing German manner the life and character of the great polemicist. Luther said: 'I don't like to govern, I am not made that way.' And speaking of his mission, he said: 'God can make many *Doctores Martinos.* If it be not done through me, some one else will complete it.' When his followers began to be called Lutherans, he was displeased. 'What is Luther?' he asked. 'The doctrine is not mine. Neither have I been crucified for any one. I am not, and I do not want to be, a master.' . . . In fact, says Doctor Holl, Luther did not know that he was going to be a revolutionist [?], and it was against his will and taste to become a reformer; he felt much relieved when he thought that as a personality he was losing authority. His only claim for himself was the merit of having used the German language with power and having forced his opponents to learn to speak German. Like a very different character, Voltaire's Candide, Father Martin would have himself preferred to cultivate his garden and be left alone, his own particular garden being the Scriptures. Neither vanity nor ambition sent Luther forth into the world. Duty motivated the quiet, jovial little man. But at duty's behest, what a road he traveled — to Wittenberg, to Worms, to the Wartburg! Vast ambition stirred Alexander, Caesar, Napoleon. It led the Macedonian to his death in Babylon, the Roman to his murder in the Senate, the Corsican to his exile in St. Helena. No doubt, vast ambition is associated with supreme gifts; yet it is a fact that many men who have influenced their time and all future time immensely have been men not so much impelled by ambition as drawn forward by duty. A portion of ambition is a good concomitant; but ambition has wrecked more men than it has made, and the greatest successes have been due not to ambition so much as to duty and the impulse of the creative faculty." MUELLER.

Religion at Union Colleges and Universities in China. — China has a considerable number of higher schools conducted and financed by Christian missionary societies, the majority of which are union institutions. None of these higher schools emphasize religion and Christian instruction any too much. And it is a significant fact that the Christian character of the institution becomes less evident, as a rule, according as the unionistic character is emphasized. A striking instance of this is afforded by the new Central China University, recently opened in Central China. This is conducted by the three oldest missions in the Wu-han cities: the London Mission, the Wesleyan Mission, and the Episcopalian. All three of these missions have been conducting middle schools and colleges in the Wu-Han cities and have now united to conduct a school of university

grade. The exceedingly "broad" character of this new institution is indicated by the fact that "Christian" is left out of its name entirely, and that "the opening exercises were opened and closed without public prayer." When a correspondent inquired through the columns of the *Hankow Daily Paper* if this "omission was not a serious neglect which for sound reasons is to be regretted," he received an answer from the president of the school rebuking him for his "ill-mannered remarks" and informing him that the omission referred to was due to the strange workings of a mind trying to do too many things at once. We shall let our readers judge whether any amount of work or excitement is an excuse for the omission of religious exercises at the opening of a school conducted by Christian missions. Suffice it for us to point out that the published aims of the school show that Christian teaching is to be relegated to a very unimportant back seat in this institution, "science" coming first and Christianity being taught only as one of many religions, with no dogmatic claims being made for any one religion. Thus it was entirely in keeping with the expressed character of the school that Christian exercises should be omitted at its opening. We only wonder why Christian church-members should wish to support a school of this sort!

The principal speaker at the opening exercises closed a lecture on "Education" with the following "vision of the future," which no doubt is quite prophetic of what this particular school is to be: "I try to see the vision of the future as it will be realized in the years to come. I picture a great university in Central China ministering to the needs of the great student population of this hub of China. I see it being joined and strengthened by other Christian institutions. I see this example being followed by other colleges, *not necessarily Christian. It may be a college teaching Confucianism, or a college teaching Buddhism.* [Italics our own.] They will be welcome so long as they bring with them the guarantee of educational efficiency and ideals of moral training. . . . I see this university growing and expanding . . . until the wisdom of the East, combining with the wisdom of the West, shall make one mighty force for the building up of a character and the making of citizens and rulers for the land. 'And wisdom is justified of all her children.'"

First, indifference to Christian doctrine, whether essential or secondary teachings; then union with other Christians, disregarding the differences; then union with the world and all the hoary heresies of the ages, including even the abominations of heathen idolatrous religions. Such is the inevitable growth of the unionistic spirit. "And wisdom is justified of her children" when we as strict Lutheran Bible Christians refuse to take the first step on the downward road, but emphasize pure doctrine as the great essential in every branch of Christian work, including that of Foreign Missions.

Communicated by *Geo. O. Lillegard*, Wanhsien, China.

Catholics, Jews, and the "Y." — *America,* of March 21, writes editorially: "With a gesture of regal liberality the Young Men's Christian Association in the State of New York proposes to allow

Catholics and Jews membership on its board of directors. But the motion is a gesture merely. On closer examination it appears that, while Catholics and Jews will be required to pay the fees exacted from all without discrimination, the Association will limit membership on the board of directors in the proportion of one Catholic or Jew to nine doughty Protestants, thereby assuring its essentially Protestant character. Sensible Catholics and Jews will decline the gesture and its possible results with thanks. For the Association is, and ever has been, a Protestant, not a Christian, Association. It is chartered as a Protestant body, and as such it may legally limit its membership as it deems fit. No fault is to be found with non-Catholics who seek its privileges, but Catholics are as out of place in an association which legally and by open avowal is Protestant as they would be in any other society founded to promote a non-Catholic creed or to foster religious interests condemned by the Catholic Church. . . . If the obligations of a director or, for that matter, of a member of the Young Men's Christian Association are found in conflict with the obligations imposed by the Catholic religion, the duties of religion must prevail. It is only the weak and the dishonorable who will falter or fail, and it cannot be thought that it is this type of men which the Association wishes to engage as its directors. The sum of the matter is that the Young Men's Christian Association is a Protestant society, and Catholics will do well to recognize towards it those duties only which are imposed by justice and charity. Membership in the Association, still less membership on its board of directors, is not one of those duties." MUELLER.

No Success after Refusing to See the Pope. — Referring to the recent publication of Mr. Roosevelt's letters in the leading dailies of our country, especially to the one in which Mr. Roosevelt explained why he refused to see the Pope, *America* (March 28), the official organ of American Jesuits, after explaining why the Pope could not receive the doughty American, goes on to say: "It is a fact that from the day that Mr. Theodore Roosevelt practically insulted the Pope in Rome, by passing through the city without calling on His Holiness, he had no success. After Mr. Roosevelt's return to America one of his first efforts in politics was to advocate the selection of Mr. Bacon as the Republican candidate for United States Senator from New York. He failed. Mr. William Calder was chosen. Mr. Roosevelt next did his best to secure the reelection, as Mayor of New York, of Mr. John Purroy Mitchell. He failed. Mr. Roosevelt ran for President against Mr. Taft and Mr. Wilson. He failed; Mr. Wilson was elected. Mr. Roosevelt went back on his campaign promises to keep up the Progressive Party and worked for the success of Mr. Charles Evans Hughes. He failed; Mr. Wilson was reelected. Mr. Roosevelt urged the nomination of Mr. Hinman as the Republican candidate for Governor of New York. He failed; Mr. Whitman was nominated and elected. Then, worn out before his time by the hardships of his foolhardy South American trip and by the fever, rheumatism, and ear malady that it brought on, he died when the Presidency was

again, probably, within his easy reach. There may be no Providential connection between these happenings and his conduct in Rome. They may be only *post hoc,* but not *propter hoc.* Still they did occur after his visit to the Eternal City. His 'usefulness as a candidate' had certainly ended. Mr. Roosevelt has been in his grave for years, but the rule still obtains — no prominent non-Catholic American will be received at the Vatican who intends, after being welcomed there, to consort with its scurrilous libelers [the Methodist Mission] in Rome. It is a matter of decency, not bigotry." MUELLER.

The Real Importance of the Discoveries at Ur. — In the *Sunday-school Times* of March 28, Melvin Grove Kyle, D. D., LL. D., President of Xenia Theological Seminary, writes: "Very much is being published concerning the discoveries at 'Ur of Chaldees,' about which mention has been made two or three times in these reviews. That which I have presented as rather casual illustrations of patriarchal history have been written up — 'up' is the word, I had almost said 'magnified' — in magazine articles and newspaper accounts to the rank of discoveries of the very first magnitude. Indeed, the way of the secular press is to represent everything that is given prominence as of the first rank in importance. But we must follow strictly scientific methods and never propaganda methods. It is not absolutely certain that the place now called in published articles 'Ur' is the home city of the patriarch Abraham. Indeed, it is far from absolutely certain. Professor Clay, than whom there is no greater master of things Babylonian, is quite confident that the Ur of Abraham was much farther up the Euphrates Valley. Yet the discoveries at this old city, now put forward as the home city of Abraham, are hardly less interesting. They are in the same valley and represent in most respects similar civilization. The most important phase of these discoveries can hardly be overestimated, though in fact it is receiving but scant attention. It is that as we get so far back in antiquity, we do not seem to get any nearer the primitive man anthropologists love to talk about. Indeed, the distinguishing characteristic of this civilization, as has been noted in the last review, is its high degree of art and craftsmanship. This is exactly what the Bible leads us to expect. It represents that the postdiluvian civilization did not begin at the beginning, did not represent primitive, unskilled man in an untouched world, but rather that the postdiluvians inherited antediluvian civilization and had around them remains of antediluvian structures. They even repeated the names of antediluvian cities, as a tablet from the Nippur library informs us. Here we have another illustration of the trustworthiness of ancient documents." MUELLER.

Lexicographers of New Testament Greek like Cremer have pointed out that classical terms like *χάρις, ἀγαπή, ἔλεος, δικαιοσύνη,* have been given a new meaning in the inspired writings of Christianity. The process involved in the change of meaning is a continuous one. At the recent Missionary Convention at Washington the missionary to the Tongas in Africa, Erwin H. Richards, illus-

trated the difficulties he had encountered in translating the Bible into Tonga. He found no words in Tonga for God, fox, bear, home, virgin, etc. He took the word closest to the idea to be expressed and used it with a new meaning which the Tongas were gradually made to understand by his explanations. For its greatest truths Christianity found no adequate terms in the human language because its greatest truths cluster around the Gospel, which is a mystery to natural man. It was no small task for the Spirit of God to speak to men in their own terms about matters for which they really had no terms.

DAU.

Would Government-Controlled Schools Be Safe? — Some of those who are advocating the nationalization of our system of popular education seem to think that they can thereby strengthen our moral safeguards. This view will have to be heavily discounted in view of the facts that have been brought out regarding the deals of the Alien Property Custodians and of the Chemical Foundation, which have now been sanctioned by a decision of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals. Properties of great value were declared by the President of the United States to be held in trust for the alien owners and therefore safe, but were later confiscated. The action is being denounced as moral fraud and legal robbery. If the schools of the country are to be entrusted, even indirectly, to the central government, they will fare no better. They will, like everything else that politicians handle, become a matter of barter and trade between political interests, and as in the case just referred to, the traders will at the psychological moment discover the patriotic motive for doing whatsoever they wish to do with the schools. DAU.

The Grand Lodge of New York, at its 144th annual communication on May 9, voted to withdraw from the Masonic International Association on the ground, stated by Grand Master William A. Rowan, "that some of the members of the Association are clandestine according to our laws and standards in that they do not have the requirements of a belief in God and do not have the Bible on their altar and are not recognized by this Grand Jurisdiction." A plea from the Association to forestall this action was not heeded. The Grand Master explained that "clandestinism" means any opposition to Masonic fundamentals. The difference between secretism and clandestinism amounts to the same thing as when an ebony-hued African calls another African a "yellow nigger." The above action is an instance of persecution of the mongrel cur by pure-bred canines. To remove the Bible from Masonic altars and belief in God from the requirements for Masonic canonicity seems a lesser indignity offered to the Christian religion than to keep the Bible and the G in the square and compass among the Masonic paraphernalia for purposes of mesmerizing the public. — The Grand Lodge of New York, at the same time, withdrew from the Masonic Service Association, which was organized at Cedar Rapids, Iowa, in November, 1919, for the purpose of rendering aid to members of the United States Army in war that were in distress. The reason given for the withdrawal was

that the Service Association "after a period of six years was floundering in an endeavor to formulate some plan to justify its existence" and had given no accounting of the use of its funds. DAU.

The confession, or doctrinal, status of Methodism, according to Gilbert T. Rowe, editor of the *Methodist Quarterly Review,* must of necessity continually undergo changes, for these reasons: 1) Methodism has freed itself from the Intellectualism which viewed the universe as being composed of fixed and dead objects of thought and views it as a living, growing reality, with whose growth Methodism keeps step. 2) It has rejected all religious hierarchy and insists on the unlimited right to the exercise of judgment and conscience. 3) It has rejected fatalism, "which reduced human ability to the vanishing point and relieved the individual of all responsibility for his own salvation." 4) It has disproved the old views of total depravity by facts of observation and experience. "Either the grace of God enables every man to turn toward good, or there is in each a remnant of natural ability, which makes it possible for him to aspire toward God and reject the wrong." 5) It has discarded "the theory of the elimination of 'the lingering remnants of the Adamic nature' by means of 'a second work of grace'" in sanctification. 6) It has abandoned the insistence on "the one ecstatic moment" which determines a person's conversion and now makes the whole of a person's life ecstatic. 7) It has liberated tender children from the duty of "trying to groan over sins they had never committed and endeavoring to sigh for relief from this vale of tears, when what they really wanted was love and a normal and happy and trustful childhood." 8) It admits no conflict between the truth of nature and the truth of the Bible, recognizes "the relative value of Holy Scripture," accepts "the principle of progressive revelation," and "is in entire sympathy with the aims of patient and reverent scholarship." 9) It has transferred the emphasis from the miraculous to the moral contents of the Bible. 10) It has reduced all positive enactments of the divine Law to the Golden Rule. 11) It has adopted a church polity and grades in the ministry "that will best serve the needs of a growing organism in each succeeding generation." Therefore the writer addresses Methodism in the closing words of *The Chambered Nautilus:* —

> Build thee more stately mansions, O my soul,
> As the swift seasons roll!
> Leave thy low-vaulted past! etc.

Has any Bible-reader the least doubt where this "growth" will end? DAU.

The fanaticism of American prohibitionists has cropped out in an attempt to revise the Bible translation now mostly in use among Christians. This has drawn forth the following editorial remarks on "Wine and the Bible" in the *Chicago Daily News* (March 16): —

"In a new translation of the Bible several American scholars who disclaim any prohibition bias or any motive alien to pure scholarship have substituted in several places the phrase 'a cake of

raisins' for the word 'wine' as used in the familiar King James Version and in later more or less authoritative translations.

"It is, of course, a question for disinterested students of history and the languages whether such a substitution is legitimate. What is clear, however, is that attempts of Volstead fanatics to revise the Bible in accordance with their notions regarding the use of wine would be as futile as they would be irreverent. There is no plea for total abstinence from intoxicating drink in either the Old or the New Testament. Jesus drank wine and caused His disciples to drink it. The ethics and ideas of the age during which the Christian religion was founded and disseminated by martyrs and prophets furnish no support for Volsteadism, and that fact had better be candidly acknowledged. Bone-dry prohibition is neither Christian nor Hebraic. It may, or may not, be socially beneficial and desirable — that is a matter for argument in the light of modern science. But religion has absolutely nothing to do with the controversy.

"Whether prohibition is better than temperance; whether Volsteadism is the sane interpretation of constitutional prohibition; whether Ontario, the only dry Canadian province, is wise in proposing 4.4 per cent. beer, to be sold by the government, as a temperance and antibootlegging measure, are important and fair issues that will have to be discussed and settled aright. But in no way is religion concerned with them."

These remarks are evidently addressed to churchmen who have made themselves unduly prominent in the agitation for the adoption of Volsteadism and are now about the only advocates of continuing the existing American abomination. They have exposed the Church to ridicule, scorn, and contempt among the common people and have not benefited the country at all. The reduction of crime which they promised has not been achieved, but the very opposite. They found some politicians who saw in the movement a prospect of power and emolument for themselves and with their aid succeeded in overriding the popular votum that had been rendered against the movement in some of the States, and that repeatedly. Who was Volstead before the bill in Congress that was named for him? What distinguished service had he rendered the country to justify the nation in entrusting this vast issue to him? And now even the text of Scripture is to bow to this movement. Here is a point where the churches have a distinct interest and the right to speak with authority. Watch those churches which have led the fight for prohibition and see whether they will not scrap Bible statements rather than let go of their fanatical delusion. But this may be necessary to reveal the iniquity of the whole movement. Prohibition, or the control of the consumption of intoxicants, as a matter of state economy might have developed into something safe and sane, reasonable and respectable. The incoming of the churches has rendered the entire movement a twofold nuisance: first, by what has been enacted, and is now being enforced, as law; secondly, by the constant intermeddling of churchmen, who have not been elected by the nation either to make or to

enforce laws, with the affairs of the state. From whatever angle the situation is studied, it is seen to be a plain, unmitigated nuisance. That the surviving elements of Puritanism and the Calvinistically oriented churches are active in these matters is not surprising, but it is a painful surprise that Lutherans should have a part in it, as *e. g.,* the Swedish Augustana Synod by its periodic endorsement of the Anti-Saloon League, and some Lutheran editors, who seem to know nothing better to say at the present time than this: Since we have this law, we must obey it. Of course, we must obey the law, but civil righteousness, let alone religious interests, ought to compel everybody to expose the antecedent, concomitant, and consequent iniquities of the law. DAU.

Blessed Peter Canisius. — On May 21 "Blessed Peter Canisius, S. J., who stemmed the Reformation," was canonized. If canonizations stand for real merit on behalf of the Roman Catholic Church, then Canisius is certainly deserving of canonization. Born May 8, 1524, he entered the order of the Jesuits in 1543, became professor and rector of the University of Ingolstadt in 1549, and rector of the college of the Jesuits in Vienna in 1551. His great influence with Emperor Ferdinand I was exerted for the suppression of Protestantism. He became the first German "provincial" of the Jesuits and established colleges of the order at Prague, Augsburg, Dillingen, and Freiburg (in Switzerland), at which place he died, December 21, 1597. He was one of the most prominent opponents of the Reformation in Germany, and the arrest of the reformatory movement in Austria and Bavaria is, to a large extent, owing to his labors and influence. To counteract the influence of the catechisms of Luther and other works of the founders of Protestantism, he wrote his *Summa Doctrinae Christianae* (1584), which was translated into nearly all languages, and a shorter catechism, *Institutiones Christianae Pietatis* (1556), which, until the middle of the eighteenth century, served as the basis of popular instruction in the Catholic schools of Germany and has, even in modern times, again come into use. Canisius also edited the letters of Jerome, Leo the Great, and Cyril of Alexandria and compiled a Catholic prayer-book. The Protestants called him "the Austrian Dog," while the Jesuits even endeavored to obtain his beatification. Their efforts, for a long time unfruitful, were at length crowned with success during the pontificate of Pius IX, who placed Canisius on the list of the *beati.* — "Blessed Canisius!" "He stemmed the tide of the Reformation!" Blessed, indeed! MUELLER.

The Sin of Birth Control. — "No sooner had the reports of the Sixth International Birth Control Conference been printed and circulated," writes *Time,* May 4, 1925, "than the great opponent of this movement uttered unalterably stern and solemn condemnation. The Roman Catholic Church suffers no compromise on this question. *America,* the leading Jesuit weekly, printed an article which concluded: 'So it is that notice is served upon America that the 'detestable thing' for which God slew Onan is to be worked for on political

grounds. . . . The activity of these propagandists upon so-called scientific and humanitarian grounds seems loudly to call for a more active defense of civic integrity and personal purity against these Shavian-Wellsian-Sangerian Onanists who work to defile the temple of the Holy Ghost.' The *Commonweal,* the organ of the Calvert Society, replied to Margaret Sanger's opinions by disputing her premises. Other Catholic periodicals of less importance gently rebuked or soundly execrated her. But it was left for Patrick Cardinal Hayes, Archbishop of New York, in his pastoral letter to mark out the impassable barrier between birth control and the law of his Church. 'Latterly, into the public eye has been thrust an open propaganda that shocks the moral sense of every true follower of Christ. Christian sentiment against it has found expression in the law of the land forbidding the dissemination of the knowledge of its practises. Yet the downright perversion of human cooperation with the Creator in the propagation of the human family is openly advocated and defended. . . . By such sin fell empires, states, and nations. Religion shudders at the wild orgy of atheism and immorality the situation forebodes. Mark you, also, that birth control is heralded as a benediction to the poor, because, forsooth, the poor have too many children and are largely responsible for defectives. Never was there cast upon the humble homes of our people a more offensive insult. Children are welcomed among the poor and the humble as angels and are treasured as jewels. . . . Nor are our humble poor, generally speaking, the breeders of defectives. Imbeciles and deformed are as likely to be born of the learned and the affluent. . . . Defectives, moreover, whether physical or mental, have immortal souls, redeemed by the blood of Christ and destined to share with the sound and the whole the vision of God for all eternity. . . . I know that our good people will bear with me for referring to this unclean thing. But it teaches the importance of our organized Catholic charities to combat the forces of evil that would exploit the bodies and ruin the souls of the children of God.' " MUELLER.

Roman Catholic Enterprise. — The *Watchman-Examiner* of April 16 writes: "The Paulist League of New York, a Roman Catholic society, is about to install one of the most powerful radio broadcasting stations in the country. It plans to reach at least 10,000,000 people with the feeblest receiving-sets, while its message can be picked up by powerful receivers within a radius of 10,000 miles. It will be the spokesman of the archbishop and of every Catholic organization. It will instruct the world in Catholic truth, discuss current events from the Catholic point of view, offer daily religious consolation to the weary and heavy-laden, minister comfort when calamity bows many in sorrow, present Catholic culture in poetry, music, and story, and drill Catholic people in the catechism. Its enormous power will render its signals audible in the daytime and in midsummer and is liable to blanket the signals of many weaker stations." This is another reason why KFUO ought to be enlarged in order that its "Gospel voice" may penetrate every nook and corner of the world.

MUELLER.

"Selling Birth Control." — Relative to the Sixth Annual International Conference on Birth Control, *America* (April 25) writes: "Reports read at the annual meeting of the American Birth Control League, where final arrangements were made for the March International Conference, show what has been done during 1924. . . . Individual women play no small part in this vicious propaganda by their personal entreaty and financial aid and by selling magazines on the streets, the very titles of which tell their shameful story. Their reports tell of hundreds of meetings held during 1924 in eighteen States under the patronage of economic, educational, and religious bodies. The Birth Control League lecturers have had their say before trade-unions, in public forums, before gatherings of teachers and of students. Admission is frequently charged, and some meetings prove highly remunerative. Those at Carnegie Hall in New York City are especially profitable; the audiences there usually have a contingent of prominent persons occupying boxes. The report of the last meeting in Carnegie Hall stated that 'the Church was represented by such leaders as Harry Emerson Fosdick, who, with a large scattering of social workers, is interested in the moral and humane aspect of birth control.' One of the 'hits' of the year made by Margaret Sanger was at the Yale Divinity School. An impression most favorable to her cause is said to have been made upon the two hundred prospective ministers who attended. The five hundred undergraduates of Bryn Mawr were appealed to for aid against the 'injustice' of keeping contraceptive information from the poor and uneducated. Before the rich and educated it is argued that by denying birth-control information to the poor, the nation is subjecting itself to the mercy of the unfit. It is boasted that all the various national elements were addressed during 1924. The Chinese students from Columbia betook themselves to the Birth Control Headquarters for their information; the Negro men and women were addressed in forum assembled; the Italians in their Cloak and Suit Makers' Union local; the Polish in their Socialist Alliance organization; the Hebrews in the Workmen's Circle, the National Yiddish School, and the locals of the Amalgamated Garment Workers' Union, whose weekly paper is very favorable to the spreading of birth-control information. Many of these foreign as well as native elements are reached through shop meetings. The Y. M. C. A. is reported to have arranged the shop meeting for these propagandists in Camden, N. J., at the Congoleum Co. plant, this meeting being followed by a shop meeting at the Lamp Black plant in the same city. At their street meetings the general public is enticed to help it in the name of liberty, which means license to disobey the law of God. The various phases of the birth-control propaganda are focused on two points: the elimination of those laws upon our statute books prohibiting the use of the mails for teaching contraception and the opportunity of legally establishing birth-control clinics. America is presumed to be behind the times. In the State of Prussia a *Sexualwissenschaft* was established last March where 'men and women of the working classes who for economic or other reasons are worried over the prospect of

additional offspring received birth-control information.' We are told that not only has England birth-control clinics, but that the prospects are that they will be set up in all the 'health centers' in Great Britain within the present year. They regret that our postal laws do not permit the American Birth Control League to insert advertisements in the public press of the kind found in the *Daily Herald,* official organ of the British Labor Party. The cleverness of these propagandists is graphically portrayed in the language of Rabbi Rudolph I. Coffee of Temple Sinai (Oakland, Cal.), one of the California representatives on the National Council of Birth Control Organizations. Rabbi Coffee has been recently honored in his home State, having been elected chaplain of the California State Assembly. Having taken a leading part in the attempt to establish a clinic, which was frustrated by the State Attorney-General, who declared it to be a violation of the law of California, Rabbi Coffee was stimulated to further activity, which the *Birth Control Review* says 'shows the spirit of the Californian group.' He wrote to his New York conferees: 'I guarantee you action in this State, and if nothing happens sooner, we shall invoke the initiative and referendum in November, 1926. If we win, we win; if we lose, we have made tremendous educational gains in enlightening the people.' . . . Much as we would like to ignore this issue, the activity of these propagandists upon so-called scientific and humanitarian grounds seems loudly to call for a more active defense of civic integrity and personal purity against these Shavian-Wellsian-Sangerian Onanists who work to defile the temple of the Holy Ghost." MUELLER.

Regarding American veneration of the national flag the *Ottawa Journal,* April 27, said editorially: —

"New York newspapers of Tuesday last contained two announcements which throw a strong light, from different angles, on aspects of American life which have always been more or less puzzling to Canadians. One related to the setting apart of Flag Week, between May 23 and 30, as a special period for the inculcation in the minds of youth of a deeper respect for the United States flag. This has been done at the instance of the United States Flag Association, of which President Coolidge is the head. The other was the publication of an address by Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick to the students of Yale, in which the speaker deplored the growth of lawlessness in the United States as an outstanding blemish on the nation.

"As we see our American friends from this side of the line, they appear to stand in no need of a special week in which to be taught respect for their flag. To us it has always seemed that no people on earth so completely and unreservedly worship their symbol of nationality. *They make a fetish of it.* It surmounts every schoolhouse. The picture of a parade in any big American city — and where are parades so numerous? — is invariably a mass of Stars and Stripes. The saluting of the flag is general and genuine. To the American people it is more than an emblem. It is a shrine. They bow before it, as an entity rather than as a thing purely symbolic.

"The thing that amazes and mystifies Canadians is that, with all this lofty reverence for the material symbol of the national spirit, there should, at the same time, be that social condition which called for such strong language from Dr. Fosdick. If bowing with bared heads before the national banner has any meaning at all, it should be of confessed loyalty for those principles which lie back of it. That means law and order. Yet few people among the civilized nations are more ready to bemoan their lawlessness than are our American neighbors.

"While it may not be in good taste to say it, — for which we ask indulgence, — the thought is irresistible that our friends to the south would do well to study with an open mind the attitude of Canadians toward the Union Jack. We do not bare our heads when it is carried past. In fact, we very rarely see it paraded at all. We unfurl it on occasions which call for patriotic rejoicing; but we make no fuss over it whatever. We take its symbolism and honorable history for granted. No people on earth have a deeper devotion to their flag than have we; but, strange as it must seem to our neighbors, that devotion is to us a thing too sacred, too precious, to seek any other manifestation than in deeds. We reserve our reverence for what the flag means to us; and that thing is British law and British justice.

"So inexplicable and ambiguous is the situation across the international boundary as respects the American flag that one would not be surprised to learn that it is flaunted with the same enthusiasm and devoutness at a lynching as at the opening of Congress. If our neighbors could catch our point of view about our flag, it is just possible it would lead to introspection. Flag Week might then come to have something else than respect for the material emblem as its purpose and be directed toward that practical expression of devotion to the law which Dr. Fosdick identified at Yale as the crying need of his country." Communicated by *Rev. H. Ruhland*, Ottawa, Can.

Dr. Fosdick on Baptism. — In his farewell sermon, preached in the First Presbyterian Church on March 1, Dr. Fosdick said: "If I had my way, baptism would be altogether an individual affair. Any one who wanted to be immersed, I would gladly immerse. Any one who wanted to be sprinkled I would gladly sprinkle. If any one was a Quaker and had conscientious scruples against any ritual, I would gladly without baptism welcome him on confession of his faith. Why not?" The *Watchman-Examiner* on March 19 comments on this as follows: "Of course, it counts for nothing with Dr. Fosdick that Jesus Christ commanded Baptism and Himself submitted to it. Dr. Fosdick repudiates the authority of the New Testament whenever it does not suit him and expressly contends that the very idea of authority is one of the historic curses of Christendom. So he finds it an easy matter to vary the administration of the divinely appointed ordinance according to the wishes of the recipient. . . . But the Baptists have never held such shifting views about Baptism, or about anything else for that matter. We are a people of sturdy convictions, and for our views of Baptism our fathers suffered and died even. We have differed from the bulk of the Christian world in attributing

no saving efficacy to Baptism, but we have never regarded the ordinance lightly. We have delighted that there was something we could do that had no relation to salvation, which would show our spirit of absolute obedience to Jesus Christ. That has always made the joy of Baptism to Baptist people."

The writer errs when he says that Baptists, by "attributing no saving efficacy to Baptism," have never "regarded the ordinance lightly." As a matter of fact, Baptists, by denying the efficacy of Baptism, so emphatically taught in the Holy Scriptures, repudiate the "authority of the New Testament" as much as Dr. Fosdick does and regard the holy Sacrament as lightly as he. Instead of esteeming Baptism as a means of grace, which bestows a free gift, they change it into an act of obedience, which benefits only inasmuch as it is a "good work." The Baptists' "joy of Baptism" is not to be rated higher than Fosdick's contempt of Baptism. Both pervert the Word of God. MUELLER.

"Kristelig Ukeblad," used by *Menighetsfakultet* as their organ, for 10 April, 1925, quotes *Aftenposten,* 30 March: It is of great interest, in connection with Dr. Richard Eriksen's splendid article in *Aftenposten* on "George Brandes and the Christ-myth," to bring back to recollection a parallel in Brandes' voluminous work on William Shakespeare.

As is known, Shakespeare has not left the world a written line of his ever-living works — except his signature in a book (the authenticity of which signature is questioned) and on a couple of contracts.

This has given some investigators occasion to doubt — and what doesn't an investigator doubt? — that Shakespeare has lived, and they prove at any rate that he could not possibly have written the works that are called his. — Produce the original manuscripts, then we will believe!

With all the scorn and the wit that Brandes' pen is capable of, he tears loose with gnashing teeth on these committers of sacrilege. He proves, in a masterly way, that no one else but Shakespeare can have written his dramas. He attaches no importance to the fact that no original manuscript is to be found.

What about Christ? Do they live less powerfully? Even if we don't possess an array of Shakespeare's manuscripts? — Even if Christ wrote only in the sand. ("End Kristus? Lever de mindre sterkt? Fast vi ikke eier en rad av Shakespeares manuskripter? — Fast Kristus bare skrev i sanden.")

Goesta af Geijerstam.

Communicated by *Rev. Faye,* St. Louis, Mo.

Glimpses from the Observer's Window. — Universal Bible Sunday, December 6, will furnish the opportunity for most celebrations of the quadricentenary of Tyndale's translation.

"Considerable as was the influence of Tyndale upon the thought of his day, it was slight in comparison with that which he has ever since exerted through his translation. Later editors of the English Bible steadily followed his version as far as they possessed it; and his work colors the New Testament of Coverdale (1535), Rogers (1537), Taverner

and the Great Bible (1539), the Geneva Bible (1560), the Bishops' Bible (1568), and the King James Version (1611). None of these is more than a revision of Tyndale, and his stamp remains on the modern revisions of 1881 and 1901. . . . Tyndale . . . has shaped the religious vocabulary of the English-speaking world." (Edgar J. Goodspeed, in *The Making of the New Testament.*) — Only the twentieth century has brought us considerable deviations from Tyndale.

"The confirmed membership list used to estimate the 'fair share' for the budget in our [Norwegian] Church has had a tendency to reduce the membership of our Church." *Luth. Church Herald*, May 12. — This may not be a real loss.

There is again a sad mix-up in membership statistics of the Christian churches for 1924. The figures of Dr. Carroll do not agree with some denominational figures.

The new Norse-American Centennial stamps (2 cts. and 5 cts., each in two colors) may be placed on sale only in seven cities: Washington, Chicago, St. Paul-Minneapolis, Decorah, Iowa, Northfield, Minn., and Benson, Minn.

The U. L. C., on Jubilate Sunday, sent out the graduating class of four from its seminary at Saskatoon to their fields of labor in Western Canada.

The Federal Trade Commission has discovered that beeswax candles made for the Catholic Mass contain only 11 per cent. beeswax instead of the 50 per cent. supposed. What an abomination has invaded the Roman Catholic Holy of Holies!

Dr. Fosdick and Rabbi Wise recently stood on the same platform. Dr. Fosdick declared Rabbi Wise to be a model Christian. Rabbi Wise reciprocated by calling Dr. Fosdick and himself twin Christians. A Siamese wonder in the theological world!

Court records of Indianapolis show that convicted robbers averaged twenty-one years of age in 1923 as compared with twenty-eight in 1913; murderers, 26, as against 32; those convicted of burglary, 21, as against 29; and so on. — We may write the increasing youthfulness of our criminals down to the credit of the non-repressionist principle of education, which, instead of pruning wild shoots, cultivates them. Weeds are not distinguished from good plants when men hold that "there is nothing either good or bad but thinking makes it so."

Otiosis locus hic non est; discede, morator — this was posted in the hotels and taverns of old Pompeii, according to the *Dearborn Independent.*

The Doukhobors of British Columbia, on religious grounds, refuse to send their children to the Canadian state schools. The Attorney-General is determined that they shall, and the Doukhobors threaten that they will parade in the nude and even risk dispossession and deportation.

In Leuba's *The Belief in God and Immortality*, p. 172 ff., the results of a questionnaire are published: "They give psychologists the lowest record for belief of all scientists — twenty per cent. (less than nine per cent. of eminent psychologists) believing in immortality, twenty-five per cent. (less than fourteen per cent. of eminent psychologists) believing in a personal God." — Herbert Sanborn in *Methodist Quarterly Review* for April.

DAU.

BOOK REVIEW.

Vacation Bible Schools for Lutheran Churches. By *Prof. P. E. Kretzmann, Ph. D., D. D.* 10 pages; 5 cts. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

Pastors, and others who are interested in vacation Bible schools, ought to send for a copy of Dr. Kretzmann's ten-page tract. FEITZ.

Men and Missions. Edited by *L. Fuerbringer.* Vol. II: *Dispelling the Spiritual Gloom in South American Forests and Pampas.* By *Aug. Burgdorf.* 88 pages; 30 cts. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

The second booklet of the series presents interesting mission material from our South American field. The man who wrote the booklet, Pastor Aug. Burgdorf, of Chicago, has not only for many years been a member of the Board for Home Missions in South America, but a number of years ago made a personal investigation of our South American field for his board and therefore is well able to give first-hand information. We recommend that our pastors urge their people, especially also the young people of our congregations, to buy and read the booklets which are published in the *Men and Missions* series. Many of our people are not much interested in our missions because they have no information in reference to them.

FRITZ.

Synodical Reports: *California and Nevada District.* Twenty-fourth Report. 24 pages; 15 cts. — *Alberta and British Columbia District.* Third Report. 51 pages; 27 cts. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

The printed minutes of the California and Nevada District contain a doctrinal essay by Prof. W. Arndt on Rom. 12, 2: "Be not conformed to this world." The report of the Alberta and British Columbia District prints the continuation of an essay by Pastor R. Shippanowski on "The Church and the Ministerial Office" and also an extended report of the School Board.

FRITZ.

Statistical Year-Book. 193 pages; $1.00. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

The *Statistical Year-Book* of our Missouri Synod for the year 1924 is now off the press. It is a tremendous piece of work to compile the many, many figures printed on the pages of this book, and therefore the book always appears rather late in the year. Besides the statistical reports of all the congregations in our large Synod the *Year-Book* gives important information on schools, missions, educational institutions, the Board of Support, charitable institutions, societies, Concordia Publishing House, church architecture, publications, finances, etc. Considering the great expense which is incurred in getting out a book of almost two hundred pages of statistical matter, the price of one dollar is very low. Not only our pastors, but also interested laymen are encouraged to purchase a copy.

FRITZ.

How to Read the Bible. By *Richard Green Moulton, LL. D., Ph. D.,* Prof. em. of Literary Theory and Interpretation in the University of Chicago. 132 pages, 4×5½. 80 cts. (Macmillan Co., New York.)

This monograph is written, as Dr. Moulton states, in the interest of the literary study of the Bible and constitutes a plea to read the Bible "like any other book." The author suggests to his readers the use of *The Modern Reader's Bible* or *The Sacred Scriptures in Modern Literary Form,* which he himself has edited with introductions and notes. The viewpoint from which the Bible facts and teachings are presented is that

of modern liberal criticism, which applies to the Holy Scriptures the principle of evolutionary development. Thus we are told: "Job is moved at times to a surety that 'even after worms have devoured this skin,' he will see his heavenly Vindicator standing upon the earth, but he does not follow up these flashes of inspiration, and the other speakers in the dialog ignore them." Again: "Ecclesiastes comes from the Judaism of Palestine, at a time when the atmosphere of Palestine is full of the novel idea of immortality." Such views are utterly at variance with the express teachings of Scripture and certainly do not help the student of the Bible in his "literary studies." The literary study of the Bible is not benefited by the hindering crutches of liberalistic theology nor by a new rearrangement of the books and chapters, nor by the ommission of portions that reflect the light of divine truth most brilliantly. To the reviewer the Holy Scriptures seem best, even for literary study, as they are presented to him in the form in which we now have them. MUELLER.

Decision Day Talks. By *Charles Francis Carter, D. D.*, Pastor of Immanuel Congregational Church, Hartford, Conn. 59 pages.

The Lost Treasure of Umdilla. A Tale of Adventure in the Dark Continent. By *Annie M. Barnes.* 244 pages.

The Son of Nicodemus. A Story of the Christ for Young People. By *Howard Agnew Johnston, Ph. D., D. D.* Introduction by *Francis E. Clark, D. D., LL. D.* 221 pages.

Mountain Peaks in the Life of Our Lord. By *William Bancroft Hill, D. D., Litt. D.* 189 pages. (All four books by Fleming H. Revell Co., New York.)

The first of these titles introduces three addresses ("Building a Character"; "My Choice"; "What Kind?") that were delivered on three successive Sundays to the members of the church-school (Sunday-school?), to induce them to choose the Christian life on Decision Day, which followed on a Sunday close to these talks. There is nothing distinctly Christian in these appeals to be "true" and "strong," etc., and about man's power of choice and his character-building efforts. Jesus is exhibited as "the type" of what is good. "There has been much argument over many questions raised about Jesus in trying to explain Him. There is no argument or dispute over the excellence of His character." (p. 25.)

The second title represents a good effort at telling many interesting facts about Christian mission-work in the Congo on the background of a story in which a superintendent of missions with his son and daughter figure prominently, and actual scenes from an African mission are exhibited. The spirit that pervades the mission-work here described is of the evangelistic Methodistic kind.

The third title is a Life of Christ for young people in the form of a story. It aims to make the events calmly related in the gospels and in the Acts more vivid.

The last title exhibits prominent events in the life of the Lord that transpired on some mountain — the author names eleven of them: the Mounts of the Preparation, Temptation, the Temple, the Twelve, the

Sermon, the Miracle, the Transfiguration, the Triumphal Entry, the Agony, the Cross, the Ascension. The author defends the deity of Christ and the Trinity as a plain teaching of Scripture. DAU.

The Lord We Love. By *Charles R. Erdman*, Professor of Practical Theology, Princeton Theological Seminary. 138 pages, 5×7½. $1.50. (George H. Doran, New York.)

In this book Dr. Erdman offers a series of devotional studies on the main events in the Savior's life, beginning with the Hymns of the Nativity and ending with Christ's Ascension. The comforting fact of the glorified Savior's triumphant descent into hell has been omitted, for reasons quite obvious, since to a Calvinistic theologian this descent means no more than the *inenarrabiles animi angustiae, cruciatus et terrores* (*Cat. Heidelb.*, Qu. 44). Likewise, in a series of this kind there should have been at least a paragraph on the *sessio ad dextram Dei*. Reformed theology is all the poorer, even in its power to comfort, because of its failure to accept and state in full the Scriptural truths with regard to Christ's person. On the whole, the author does not enter deeply into the great subjects with which he deals, but is satisfied with a few simple lessons derived from them. This is the twelfth volume from the pen of Dr. Erdman, and in view of the superficial character of this last effort a warning against the sin of polygraphy might not be out of place. MUELLER.

One Thousand Best Bible Verses, with Practical Helps for Memorizing Them. By *J. B. Smith, D. D.* 126 pages, 4½×6½. (Bible Institute Colportage Association, Chicago.)

The purpose of this brochure is to induce Christians to practise the art of memorizing Bible-passages by suggesting to them a method which renders the task easier. In making these selections of Scripture-passages, the author has kept the following considerations in mind: 1. Ease of memory as based on simplicity and brevity. 2. Verses that "grip" were given most favorable consideration; for such as evoke keenest interest are most readily remembered. 3. An effort was made to include verses on all the great fundamental doctrines of the Bible. 4. Verses with messages vital to Christian experience and life were given a large place. 5. One verse or more was selected from every book of the Bible. The verses are separated according to sentence-thoughts, while the name of the book is printed on top, and the reference on the side. The following scheme illustrates the author's method: —

ROMANS.

166 (verse to be memorized from the New Testament).
I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ;
for it is the power of God unto salvation
to every one that believeth 1, 16.

167
By the deeds of the Law
there shall no flesh be justified
in His sight. 3, 20.

We welcome any new method that aids the Christian in learning by heart the sacred passages of God's Word. MUELLER.

The Cause and Cure of Infidelity. By *Rev. David Nelson, M. D.* 399 pages, 5½×7½. $1.75. (Geo. H. Doran Co., New York.)

In spite of the great number of new books that are daily placed upon the market many good books published decades ago are still holding the interest of the reading public and commanding a ready sale. Nelson's *Cause and Cure of Infidelity* is one of the "famous old" books which even to-day deserve careful perusal. Neither the cause nor the cure of infidelity has changed, and therefore the arguments and pleas of the author, written years ago, still hold good. While we do not endorse every statement made in the book, and while in particular the chapters that present the "evidence of experience" contain much with which we cannot agree, there is so much in this book that is helpful in refuting infidelity and strengthening faith in Christianity that we cheerfully recommend it to our readers. The argumentation throughout is clear and convincing, and the style is lucid. Of special value are the chapters on "The Author's Unbelief and the Means of Rescue," since here the writer speaks out of the depths of his heart on matters that concern his salvation. Of the former editions more than 100,000 copies were circulated, and scores of infidels, it is claimed, were restored to faith through the reading of this book. MUELLER.

Buddhism and Buddhists in China. By *Lewis Hodous, D. D.*, Professor of Missions in China at the Kennedy School of Missions, Hartford, Conn. 80 pages, 5×7. $1.25. (Macmillan Co., New York.)

Dr. Hodous, the author of this interesting and instructive monograph, spent sixteen years of missionary service in Foochow (China), which is an important center of Buddhism, thus having an opportunity of studying the subject at first hand. Some of the chapters are: The Entrance of Buddhism into China; The Establishment of Buddhism as the Predominating Religion of China; Buddhism and the Family; Buddhism and Social Life; Buddhism and the Future Life; The Spiritual Values Emphasized by Buddhism in China; The Christian Approach to Buddhists. The paragraphs on "Emphasis on the Esthetic in Christianity," "Emphasis on the Mystical in Christianity," etc., in which the author suggests a nearer approach of Christianity to Buddhism by stressing the beautiful and mystical in the Christian religion, contain suggestions that are both wrong and dangerous. The book is of value, not only because it is most interestingly written, but because it offers information gained at first hand on a subject upon which there is still much confusion. The author speaks with authority. The volume is the third to be published in a series on "The World's Living Religions," projected in 1920 by the Board of Missionary Preparation of the Foreign Missions Conference of North America. MUELLER.

Brief Mention.

In a beautiful souvenir publication Holy Cross Lutheran Congregation of St. Louis has commemorated the seventy-fifth anniversary of the founding of its parochial school. — Pastor Geo. C. Koenig's congregation at New York City has issued an artistic brochure describing **The New Saint Paul's Church, Crotona Ave. and East 178th St.**, and a similar order of service for their cornerstone-laying on May 17. DAU.